

### REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 28-33, 35-38, and 40 under 35 USC 102, and claim 39 under 35 USC 103. Claim 34 has been allowed.

Claims 35 and 36 have been amended. Claim 44 has been added. Thus, claims 1-5 and 28-44 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

#### *Response to Arguments*

With regards to claims 1 and 40, the Examiner asserted the chassis is comprised of both element 10 (hood) and element 30 (enclosure) therefore the handle does in fact attach to chassis. This is incorrect. The hood is a distinct from the chassis. The hood and the chassis make up the enclosure. As stated in the opening paragraph of Gan, "...a computer enclosure in accordance with the present invention comprises a hood 10, a chassis 30, a storage frame 40 secured in the chassis 30, and a fastener 60 for attaching the hood to the storage device frame 40 (Col. 2, lines 10-15)." And as stated in the abstract and shown in Fig. 1, "...a handle (66) pivotably attached to the hood (10)." The handle therefore does not attach to the chassis.

With regards to claim 4, the Examiner asserts that slits 624 are hooks. This is incorrect. Slits are slits and not hooks. These are opposite teachings. Slits are defined as a cut that is relatively straight and long; also a long narrow opening. The hooks 12 of Gan are more likely to be considered hooks as this is how Gan defines them.

With regards to claim 5, the hooks 12 are fixed on the hood 10 and therefore they are not movable. The sliding plate 62 of Gan includes slits 624, but as discussed above slits are not hooks.

With regards to claim 36, see claim 4 above. Slits 624 are not flanges. They are long narrow openings.

With regards to claim 38, the Examiner asserts that Gan teaches a stiffener. The Examiner is reading too much into the drawings. Gan is completely silent to stiffening the door,

and further to a stiffening element that is attached to the door. The Examiner is respectfully requested to show where *Gan* teaches stiffening. Pointing to an element in the drawings is not enough. Other evidence is needed in order to maintain this argument. Furthermore, even if the element is a stiffener, how do we know that it is a distinct element that is attached to the hood. For all the Examiner knows, this is metal formed from a single sheet of metal?

It should be noted that while dictionary terms are useful, it is the specification of the present invention which should be relied upon to define the terms of the claims.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1-5, 28-33, 35-38, and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Gan et al* (6,775,144).

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 1 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a quick release handle that is pivotally coupled to the housing..." In *Gan*, the handle 66 is attached to the hood 10 not the chassis 30. See for example Col. 3 lines 16-19 and Figs. 1 and 2. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 35 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...the removable access door not having any movable parts thereon." In *Gan*, the hood 10 include a movable handle 66. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Also in contrast to *Gan*, claim 35 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a quick release handle positioned at the housing..." As mentioned above, the handle 66 is attached to the hood 10 not the chassis 30. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 40 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a handle that is pivotally coupled to the housing..." Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Although the rejections to the dependent claims 2-5, 28-34, 36-39 and 41-43 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above, it should be noted that they provide additional language that is unsupported by the cited art. For example:

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 4 specifically requires, "...a plurality of retention hooks located on the housing..." In *Gan*, the chassis side includes slits 624 and 422 and not hooks. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 5 specifically requires, "...wherein the retention hooks are movable between an engagement position...and a disengagement position..." *Gan* simply does not teach or suggest hooks that are movable. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 36 specifically requires, "...housing side locking mechanism includes a plurality of flanges..." In *Gan*, the chassis side includes slits 624 and 422 and not flanges. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 38 specifically requires, "...a stiffener that is attached to an inner surface of the access door..." and further "the stiffener being configured for insertion into a recess within the access opening when the access door covers the access opening." While *Gan* may show edging as suggested by the Examiner, *Gan* simply does not teach or suggest an additional structural element that is attached to the door. See for example Figs. 5A and 5B of the present invention. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

#### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

Claim 39 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gan* in view of *Worley et al* (6,359,214) and further in view of *Radu et al.* (6,542,384).

*Worley* and *Radu* do not overcome the deficiencies of *Gan*. That is, none references teaches or suggest "...a quick release handle configured to facilitate the engagement and disengagement of the locking mechanisms via a pivoting action..." as disclosed in claim 35 from which claim 39 depends. In addition, none of the references teach or suggest, "wherein an EMI gasket is positioned around the outer perimeter of the stiffener..." as disclosed in claim 39. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Claim 34 has been allowed if rewritten to overcome the objection.

**SUMMARY**

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Quin C. Hoellwarth  
Reg. No. 45,738

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300